DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 378 SO 012 020

AUTHOR Nelson, Barbara J.
TITLE Clients and Bureaucracies: Applicant Evaluations of Public Human Service and Benefit Programs.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 79
NOTE 63p.; Prepared for Delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, D.C., September 1, 1979)
AVAILABLE FROM Xerox University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Age Groups; Agency Role; Data Analysis; Ethnic Groups; *Evaluation; *Participant Satisfaction; *Performance; Research Methodology; *Social Agencies; *Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

The research investigates the sources of applicant satisfaction with public social benefit and service programs. The hypothesis is that applicant satisfaction can be explained by analyzing the act of help-seeking in terms of personal characteristics and goals; and that applicants who receive benefits evaluate agency helpfulness, fairness, and consideration more positively. The paper examines what type of applicant contacts which agency; what group of applicants, with what agency experiences, receives benefits or services; and how applicants evaluate their encounters. Data from 1,564 agency applications shown in a 1972 survey is analyzed, using 16 variables with cross-tabulation, measures of association and their tests of significance, and analysis of variance. Findings show that the elderly, well-educated, wealthy, and whites applied to federal insurance agencies, while blacks and Hispanics went to welfare and vocational agencies. Overall level of success was 74% and came more often to whites, elderly, those who applied to federal insurance or welfare agencies, and those who received assistance in presenting claims. Fifty percent of every social, economic, and demographic group found the agencies very helpful, considerate, and fair. Receiving benefits or services, obtaining adequate assistance, education, and income were the most important variables. Conclusions show that applicant satisfaction rests primarily on receiving benefits or services and obtaining sufficient assistance in claims presentation. Implications are that agencies can provide more satisfaction by routinizing and clarifying rules, and by publicizing them better. Eleven tables and models illustrate the research. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178378

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara J. Nelson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CLIENTS AND BUREAUCRACIES:
APPLICANT EVALUATIONS OF PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICE AND BENEFIT PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Barbara J. Nelson
Princeton University

SP 012 020

Prepared for Delivery at the
1979 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association
Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.
September 1, 1979

Copyright by the American Political Science Association, 1979

CLIENTS AND BUREAUCRACIES:
APPLICANT EVALUATIONS OF PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICE AND BENEFIT PROGRAMS

Barbara J. Nelson
Princeton University

America is a nation of clients. In addition to, almost in contradiction with, the national rhetoric of self-reliance, Americans have grown to expect and depend on governmental intervention to relieve personal financial and social problems. For 1972, national survey data show that almost 40% of the adult population (52 million individuals) had applied to or were receiving public social benefits or services. Indeed, in recent years more people have been clients of, or applicants to, public social programs than have voted in any other than presidential elections. The sheer magnitude of social program utilization urges inquiry as to how applicants evaluate these bureaucratic encounters. But even more than numbers, the issue of applicant evaluation of public social service and benefit programs is important because it acknowledges the transformation of American democracy. Nineteenth century American democracy emphasized interest articulation whereas, in the twentieth century, emphasis has moved to governmental action. It is no longer sufficient to view satisfaction with government merely as satisfaction with access to decision making. When government activities constitute 30.0% of the GNP, satisfaction must also include a positive evaluation of government performance.

This paper investigates one aspect of performance evaluation

of public social benefit and service programs: how applicants judge the organizational performance of public social agencies. But to investigate performance evaluation, we also need to know what kinds of applicants seek which particular benefits and services, and who among them receives public aid.

Most prior research on performance evaluation has not considered these three questions together. The two major politically-oriented studies of applicant satisfaction are Daniel Katz and associates' book Bureaucratic Encounters and Charles Goodsell's paper "Client Evaluations of the Bureaucratic Encounter: A Comparative Study of Welfare Programs."[1] Both reported that over 70% of social program clients found their experiences "very" or "fairly" satisfactory, as measured on a four point scale.[2] This congruence of findings is particularly notable given that each analysis employed very different methodology. Bureaucratic Encounters reported results of a national survey whereas Goodsell employed sidewalk interviews with applicants to Social Security, Unemployment Compensation and General Welfare.

The general positive evaluation found in Bureaucratic Encounters carries over to more specific dimensions: roughly 80% of the respondents reported that it was not hard to find an office or official to handle their problems, and approximately two-thirds or more of the respondents felt that people at the office made sufficient effort to help them, that as clients they had been treated fairly, that agency personnel were helpful, and that agencies were efficient. Certainly, these findings varied somewhat by socio-economic and demographic groups, and by the specific agencies visited. In general, whites and the elderly

expressed higher levels of satisfaction than blacks and young people. Clients of retirement programs were frequently more satisfied than clients of job finding, job training, worker compensation, unemployment compensation and welfare programs.[3]

Katz and associates recognized that a portrait of satisfied or dissatisfied users did not sufficiently illuminate the process leading to satisfaction. "...It was unclear" they wrote, "whether the variations in satisfaction...could be attributed to the quality of the functioning of the agency, the nature of the service rendered, or the type of clientele served."[4] Multivariate analysis to predict satisfaction using age, race, income, sex, education, occupation and type of agency as independent variables explained only 14% of the variance.

These findings lead us to ask what beyond agency functioning, the nature of the service and the type of clientele served, explains the process of applicant satisfaction. We hypothesize that applicant satisfaction can be further explained by analyzing the act of help-seeking itself. More than anything else, help-seeking is an instrumental, goal-directed activity. The primary goal of applicants is to get benefits or services, and thus begin to ameliorate their economic or social problems. In addition, we can hypothesize that applicants want to be treated well in the claims process, to approach or achieve closure on their problems, to face reasonable, understandable rules of entitlement and evenhanded application of those rules, and be treated as deserving of the benefits or services sought.

Further, we suggest that there is a link between the social, economic and demographic findings on applicant satisfaction

and the proposed goal-orientation of applicants. The link consists of the social legitimacy of programs as seen in part by their principles of entitlement. The principle of entitlement for social insurance programs is contribution to a "holding fund" by employees and/or their employers, whereas applicants to welfare programs become entitled on the basis of culturally deemed appropriate need. Vocational programs, on the other hand, seek to prevent future public dependency by developing or channeling work potential.

Social insurance programs evoke the most cultural legitimacy. In the United States social insurance programs have enshrined the differences between the "deserving" and "undeserving" needy. Contributory programs were designed to respond to need arising from aging, the dangers of the workplace, and swings in economic cycles, all common and relatively uncontrollable sources of need. Moreover, the psychology of contribution, if not the finances of it, has led workers themselves to embrace the ideology of being deserving. The undeserving poor, those whose want is traditionally believed to be a product of laziness and moral degradation are more frequently served by welfare or means-tested programs, not based on prior contribution. Social insurance programs provide planning for future dependency and welfare programs respond to immediate want. The social legitimacy of vocational programs rests on a view favoring prevention and rehabilitation.

The concept of social legitimacy goes beyond traditional emphasis on deservingness, however. Seen in its entirety, social legitimacy is a circle where deservingness is buttressed by

contribution, which is buttressed by fairly clear-cut and unambiguous events precipitating help-seeking (such as the retirement of a worker) which in turn are buttressed by non-arbitrary, routinized eligibility rules, all of which are buttressed by high success rates in receiving benefits or services. The significance of the circle for individual applicants is that those who bring personal and vocational skills to the application process will be treated in a less objectionable manner, have higher success rates in achieving benefits or services and thus more positive evaluations of bureaucratic encounters. All parts of this circle are present for most Federal insurance programs, i.e., the Social Security Administration's Old Age and Survivors Program, Veterans Administration programs, Railroad Retirement, and Government Employees Retirement and Disability programs. The Social Security Disability Insurance program is an exception, both because the onset of disability may be gradual and the program's decision rules less routine. Difficulty in determining what does or ought to constitute disability is the major reason for lack of routinized decision rules.

Thus the social legitimacy of agencies provides the link between personal characteristics, help-seeking goals and satisfaction in the following manner: by structure and purpose socially legitimate agencies facilitate applicants meeting their help-seeking goals, yielding satisfaction with the encounter. These varying agency purposes and structures in turn encourage somewhat different groups to apply to different programs. To explicate these linkages, especially to show the reasons for applicant satisfaction with public social programs, this research

tries to answer three questions.

1. What type of applicants contact which agencies?
2. What groups of applicants, with what agency experiences, receive benefits or services?, and
3. How and why applicants evaluate their encounters with public social programs?

DATA AND METHODS

To investigate the goal-oriented approach to applicant satisfaction with public human services, we have employed the "Service Organization and the Public" data. The data derive from a 1972 survey based on a probability sample of the adult population (age eighteen and over) of the continental United States. The sample includes 8,090 households within each of which one eligible respondent was selected at random. Interviews were completed for 6,493 respondents representing a response rate of 80.3%. Ninety-two percent of the respondents were heads of households or their spouses. Compared with the 1970 U.S. Census, the sample had 5.5% more women, 6.0% fewer white men, 5.7% fewer single persons and 2.0% more persons age 65 and over.

The subpopulation of the larger study which forms the basis of this analysis includes respondents who applied to one or more of the following public agencies within twelve months prior to their interviews: Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance in the Social Security Administration, Veterans Administration programs, Worker Compensation, Unemployment Compensation, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Job Placement Services, Aid to the Blind or Aid to the Permanently and Totally

Disabled (now in the Supplementary Security Income program), Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Low Cost or Public Housing, Food Stamps, State or Local Public Assistance, Job Training Programs, Legal Aid, State Programs for Sickness and Temporary Disability Insurance (only available in Rhode Island, California, New Jersey, New York and Hawaii), Railroad Retirement and Government Employees Pension and Disability Programs.

It is important to emphasize that the subpopulation used in this analysis is a sample of the incidence population of people who contacted public social services in the year prior to interviewing. This group differs from the population researched by Katz and associates. They asked their questions about satisfaction focusing on the respondent's most salient contact with a social agency, regardless of when that contact occurred. This technique provides a type of prevalence (ever-contacted-an-agency) sample. Using the "Service Organization and the Public" data, Figure I shows the distribution of contacts by agency for the incidence population (those contacting agencies within a year prior to their interviews) and the prevalence population (those ever-contacting particular agencies). A prevalence sample, like that used in Bureaucratic Encounters, includes many more applications to retirement programs because these applicants tend to be long-time beneficiaries.

The unit of analysis in this research is an application to an agency, not an individual respondent. About 37% of the respondents who sought public social benefits or services contacted more than one agency. Specifically, of all the 6,493 persons interviewed in this survey, 2,504 sought help from

public social agencies, generating 3,432 applications. In this data set each of those applications was treated as a separate record. For example, an elderly woman who sought Social Security benefits and Food Stamps would occur in the sample twice. Her personal characteristics would, of course, remain the same. She would, however, have been asked two separate sets of questions about her application experiences. For each application, her personal characteristics would have been added to that specific set of agency questions to form one application record. In the year prior to the interview, 1,564 applications were made, and these constitute the data set for this analysis.

Three variables, agency helpfulness, fairness and consideration, were employed to measure satisfaction. For each agency contacted respondents were asked:

1. In your opinion, how helpful (is/was) this agency to you? Would you say that it (is/was) very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not at all helpful?
2. In your opinion, how fair (is/was) the agency in its dealings with you? Would you say that it (is/was) very fair, somewhat fair, or not at all fair?
3. In your opinion, how considerate (are/were) the people at this agency toward you as a person? Would you say that they (are/were) very considerate, somewhat considerate, or not at all considerate?

These three dimensions were designed to tap in some general way agency responsiveness (helpful), outcome justice (fair) and procedural decency (considerate). The use of everyday words such as "helpful," "fair" and "considerate" had advantages and disadvantages. Respondents were certainly familiar with the words and not intimidated by them. On the other hand, the words

admittedly lack precision, are not tightly bound in meaning, and probably suggested different things to different people.

To explain the role of social, economic and demographic variables in satisfaction six variables were used: age, sex and race, total family income, education, level of work disability, and ability for independent living. Due to the small size of the groups, blacks and Hispanics were coded together in the race variable. Asian-Americans and other small racial groups within the sample were eliminated from the race variable.

Work disability and ability for independent living are not frequently employed in this type of research and require further explanation. The Work Disability Index, which is explained in detail in Appendix A, was computed only for persons age 64 or less. It combines information about present employment status, and job changes, reductions in hours worked and modifications made in job requirements or environment due to ill health. The Independent Living Index, explained in Appendix B, evaluates a person's physical limitations with respect to ordinary daily activities, such as dressing, bathing, eating, leaving one's residence, shopping and household chores and other activities.

To test the hypothesis that help-seeking encounters are evaluated on the basis of how well applicants meet their help-seeking goals, five variables were routinely employed: status of application, assistance in claims presentation, closure on problems, routinization of decision criteria and the social legitimacy of the program as measured by type of agency, either social insurance, welfare or vocational. At several stages of the analysis two other variables describing the quality of

bureaucratic encounters were employed: the number of agencies contacted and the number of trips necessary to complete the application. Since the goal-oriented view of help-seeking depends on agency response, these variables are all organizational. The survey methodology of this research does not permit us to investigate other organizational variables which might affect applicants meeting their goals, such as how busy particular agencies or bureaucrats were, or the effects of various management arrangements within and between programs.

The status-of-application variable measures the principal applicant goal: attaining benefits or services. The variable reports the stage of an application at the time of the interview. These stages range from receiving benefits or services, to being accepted for benefits or services, but waiting for them to commence, to an application still under consideration, to finally a rejected application.

To measure how well applicants were treated in the application process, the claims assistance variable was created from two questions. Respondents were asked whether "When you were applying, did you feel the need for help from someone who knows how to deal with agencies such as this?" and "Did you get any help of this kind?" Answers to these questions were assigned to one of three categories: those who received more help in the application process than they felt they needed, those who received as much help as they felt they needed (i.e., both those who needed and received help, and those who did not need nor receive help), and those who received less assistance than they felt they needed.

Lack of closure on one's problems was noted by a negative response to the following question: "Was there any time during the last 12 months when you had an employment problem, a financial, legal or housing problem, or something similar that you thought one of these agencies might have helped you with (but you didn't contact them)?"

The concept of reasonable and understandable rules of entitlement and their even-handed application is presented in a variable called "routinization." Routinized decisions are based on clear-cut criteria such as eligibility for retirement benefits upon reaching a certain age. Non-routine decisions, on the other hand, prevail when entitlement criteria are diffuse and entail a strong element of human judgment. Examples of such decisions include those made in vocational rehabilitation agencies and employment services which are based on applicants' potential for employment. Some agencies administer multiple programs which vary in levels of routinization. A notable example is Social Security under which decisions concerning retirement benefits are highly routinized, while decisions concerning disability benefits are not. Thus, classification according to this characteristic had to be based on programs rather than agencies. In this analysis, routine criteria agencies and programs include the Old Age and Survivors program in Social Security, Veterans Administration benefits, Railroad Retirement benefits, and programs for pensions and disability benefits for government employees. All other agencies have non-routine decision criteria.

The social legitimacy of a bureaucratic encounter is presented by classifying applications into social insurance, welfare

or vocational categories. Insurance programs have been further divided into Federal insurance programs which are uniform throughout the country, and as seen above, are highly routinized, and Federal-State insurance programs which may be authorized by Federal or State legislation but whose rules and procedures differ from state to state and are somewhat less routinized. Federal insurance agencies include the Old Age, Survivor and Disability programs in Social Security, Veterans Administration programs, Railroad Retirement, and Government Employees Retirement and Disability programs. Federal-State insurance agencies include Worker Compensation, Unemployment Compensation and the five State Programs for Temporary Disability Insurance. Welfare agencies include Aid to Families with Dependent Children, State and Local Public Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled (the latter two programs are now located in Supplementary Security Income), Low Cost or Public Housing, Food Stamps and Legal Aid. Vocational programs include Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Job Training Programs and Job Placement Services.

The two infrequently used organizational variables were coded straightforwardly. Respondents were categorized as having either one, or two or more agency contacts. Similarly, the number of trips necessary to complete an application ranged from zero to three or more.

The research employed several analysis techniques: cross-tabulation, measures of association and where appropriate their tests of significance, and analysis of variance. Analysis of variance was used to create three multivariate models of the

sources of applicant satisfaction. The specifications for this technique are given immediately prior to that section of the analysis.

ANALYSIS:

What type of applicants contacted which agencies?

The analysis of the relationship between type of applicants and type of agencies requires two investigations. First we need to know which groups of applicants approach which types of agencies. Second, we need to know what is the social composition of different types of agencies by groups of applicants.

As Figure 2 shows in detail, elderly applicants, those with 13 or more years of education, and applicants whose total family income in 1972 equaled or exceeded $15,000, were more likely to approach Federal insurance agencies than any other type of agency. Whites were more likely to approach either type of insurance (Federal or Federal-State) agencies than blacks and Hispanics, who primarily approached welfare and vocational agencies. And not surprisingly, poorer applicants were much more likely to apply to welfare agencies, which by definition require a lack of resources for eligibility. These general findings support the notion that those whose needs are most culturally legitimate (e.g., the elderly) and those whose life circumstances are already quite promising (e.g., the well-to-do and well-educated) approach agencies which at least by definition are easier to deal with. In other words, those who already have the greatest piece of the social pie apply to agencies most likely to sustain or enhance their somewhat advantaged position.

It is not enough, however, merely to look at the social tracking of applicants to agencies. Such a view of explaining the relationship of applicants to agencies is analagous to leaving a description of poverty with the statement that 30% of blacks fall below the U.S. Bureau of the Census' poverty-line.[5] We also need to describe the social composition of different types of agencies, a description which mitigates to some extent the social determinism of the relationship between groups of applicants and types of agencies. Figure 3 shows, for example, that the applicant pool to Federal Insurance agencies had only 25.3% applicants age 65 or older, even though 66.9% of the elderly (see Figure 2) applied to such agencies. Similarly, although 62.5% of black and Hispanic women applied to welfare agencies, only 26.1% of the applicants to these agencies were black or Hispanic women. Likewise, 19.2% of those age 30 or under applied to vocational agencies, but this age group comprised 56.9% of all vocational program applications. Another interesting finding about vocational programs is that 39.2% of applicants had 13 or more grades of education, which seems at first glance counter to the goal of vocational programs improving low levels of skills. However, vocational programs also match skills and jobs, most notably through Job Placement Services. Almost 83% of the vocational applicants with better than a high school education were contacting this agency.

What groups of applicants with what agency experiences received benefits or services?

In this section we present the findings relating groups

of applicants and types of organizational experiences with success in receiving benefits or services. It is important to note that the overwhelming majority (73.7%) of applicants to social programs received benefits or services. Another 8.6% had been accepted but were waiting for benefits or services to begin. Many of these applicants contacted the Social Security Disability program which mandates a waiting period before benefits begin, or alternatively, had sought public housing which has notoriously long waiting lists. At the time of the interview 7.0% of the applications were still under consideration and only 10.6% overall had actually been rejected. Another 4.4% did not respond to the question and were eliminated from further analysis in this section. Assuming that decision rules have high validity[6] and are fairly administered, the finding that only 10.6% of applicants were rejected suggests that agencies are rather efficient at discouraging those not eligible from applying. However, agencies may be discouraging an unknown number of eligible applicants from seeking public social aid.[7]

The analysis of who succeeds at receiving benefits or services proceeds in two sections: a description of the relationship between social, economic and demographic characteristics and receiving aid, and a description of the relationship of bureaucratic experiences and receiving aid. Four findings are important in presenting the social characteristics analysis, two of which support popular conceptions of bureaucratic response and two of which contradict popular beliefs.

Supporting popular beliefs are the findings that the elderly are more successful in receiving benefits and services,

and that blacks and Hispanics are less successful. Specifically, Figure 4 reports that 85.5% of applicants age 65 or older had received benefits or services, a level approximately 10% better than any other age group. Blacks and Hispanics on the other hand, had aggregate acceptance levels roughly 10% lower than whites: 65.3% compared to 76.2%. However, blacks and Hispanics did not have substantially higher rejection levels than whites. Just over 13% of blacks and Hispanics were rejected compared to 9.9% whites. More blacks and Hispanics were waiting for services to commence or had applications under consideration than did whites.

With charges of racism in social programs prevalent,[8] it is important to pause to examine the potential causes of lower application success levels among blacks and Hispanics. We examined two possible explanations for racial differences in application outcomes. It might have been that lower levels of receiving benefits or services among blacks and Hispanics was a function of the type of agency contacted or level of education. We found, however, that levels of receiving benefits or services were roughly 10% lower for blacks and Hispanics contacting each type of agency except federal-state insurance, and for all educational groups except those having between nine and eleven years of schooling. In fact, blacks and Hispanics with 12 or more grades education were almost 20% less likely to have received benefits or services than were whites. Blacks and Hispanics with eight or fewer grades education were only 10% less likely than whites to be receiving help.

Rejection levels remained similar for both racial groups

for all educational categories except the poorly schooled, where black and Hispanic rejection levels more than doubled white rejection levels: 16.0% compared to 7.2%. Likewise rejection levels for blacks and Hispanics were roughly comparable to whites for each type of agency contacted except for Federal insurance programs where again they doubled white rejection rates: 16.1% to 7.1%. The consistent pattern of lower levels of receiving benefits or services, approximately equivalent rejection levels, and high levels of waiting for help to commence or applications to be adjudicated suggests that if racism is at work it is expressed by the slowdown of applications for blacks and Hispanics.

Popular beliefs of bureaucracy also hold that the well-to-do and the well-educated will be more successful in presenting their claims and achieving aid than the poor or poorly educated because higher status people have the interpersonal skills and the "connections" to be successful. Correspondingly, the culture supports the belief that those with the most serious limitations in caring for themselves have a highly legitimate claim on public bounty and therefore are likely to be successful in attaining help. Neither assumption was borne out in this analysis. Figure 4 shows that education and income did not affect either levels of receiving services or benefits or levels of rejections. (Neither crosstabulation was significant at the $p = 0.05$ level using the X^2 statistic). Thus, though racism may be at work on benefit determination, classism seems not to be.

Neither, however, did the system respond in accordance to national ideals when it came to providing benefits or services for those who could not care for themselves, but who by the

nature of the sample were not institutionalized. Applicants requiring personal care for everyday living had the highest rejection level of any social group (27.8%) and the lowest level of receiving benefits (55.6%). Admittedly, those requiring personal care constituted only a very small percentage (2.3%) of the total applicant population. Nonetheless, the low success levels of very incapacitated applicants can only fuel the trend toward institutionalization, with all its financial burdens for family and government, and ultimate loss of independence for individuals.

While age and race were the two most important social factors associated with receiving benefits or services, type of agency and assistance in claims presentation were the two most important bureaucratic factors. Residual need for services, routinization of decision making, the number of agencies applied to, and the number of trips necessary to complete an application had no significant affect on receiving benefits or services.

Figure 4 shows that vocational agencies had the lowest acceptance levels (47.1%) of all types of agencies, and the highest percentage (28.7%) of applicants waiting for benefits or services to begin. Acceptance levels in Federal insurance, Federal-State insurance, and welfare agencies hovered at about 75%. Rejection levels for all types of agencies were roughly the same at approximately 10%.

Hidden within the type-of-agency groupings is one other important finding. Figure 5 which reports status of application for each agency shows that with the exception of Legal Aid, it was service or benefit-in-kind programs which had the lowest

acceptance and often the highest rejection levels. The acceptance level for Low Cost or Public Housing was 42.4%, 46.6% for Employment or Job Placement Services, 44.5% for Job Training Programs, and 55.6% for Vocational Rehabilitation Programs. Often substantial percentages (16%-30%) of applicants to these agencies were experiencing the waiting-for-services-to-begin bottleneck. This finding suggests the existence of severe constraints on the availability of services and benefits-in-kind due to lack of political commitment, concern from the private sector about governmental competition or interference (both are evident in Public Housing and Job Training) or scheduling delays (as is the case in Vocational Rehabilitation Services).

Receiving assistance in presenting one's claim to an agency also markedly affected receiving benefits or services. Figure 4 reports that those who received extra assistance in presenting their claims were twice as likely to receive benefits or services than those who felt they needed claims assistance but received non: 80.8% compared to 41.6%. Similarly, the rejection level among those who received extra claims assistance was twenty times smaller than that among applicants who felt passed over in their quest for claims assistance. (The rejection level for those receiving extra assistance was 1.9% compared to 39.8% for those feeling passed over.) Those who received as much claims assistance as they felt necessary faired almost as well as those who received extra attention.

Were applicants who needed but did not receive claims assistance different than other applicants? The answer is "yes" on three important dimensions. This group had a high percentage

of black and Hispanic women (26.2%), a large percentage of welfare applicants (20.5%, which was twice the percentage of welfare applicants in the two other groups), and a very large percentage (33.9%) requiring three or more trips to complete their applications. These findings support the proposed linkages between social legitimacy, bureaucratic experience, and the outcome of bureaucratic encounters. It appears to have been a case of those who need most got least.

To the extent that receiving benefits or services rests in part on the adequacy of claims presentation, these findings point to the usefulness of targeting help in claims presentation. The one caveat to this suggestion, however, is that most respondents knew the outcome of their applications when asked the questions on assistance in claims presentation. Those who were rejected may have, in retrospect, concluded they needed but did not receive assistance in claims presentation. Future research on the role of this variable may want to examine the effects of claims presentation in a situation where applicants do not know the outcome of their encounter.

Applicant Evaluations of Bureaucratic Encounters

The last two analysis sections have shown that applicants are indeed tracked to particular types of agencies, and that age, race, type of agency, and claims assistance all affect the likelihood of receiving benefits or services. This last analysis section turns to the question of how all these factors affect applicant satisfaction with public social agencies. The analysis proceeds in two parts. First, we investigate how social, economic

demographic and goal-oriented variables individually affect applicant judgments of agency helpfulness, fairness and consideration. Second, we investigate the multivariate sources of applicant satisfaction.

In general, applicants were noticeably positive about their help-seeking encounters with public social programs, findings quite similar to Goodsell's and Katz and associates'. For each measure of evaluation -- helpful, fair and considerate -- Figure 6 shows that at least 55% of recent applicants reported being "very" satisfied, as measured on a three point scale. However, twice as many applicants found agencies "not at all" helpful, as compared with "not at all" fair or considerate: 16.5% to 9.9% and 8.8% respectively. In addition, approximately 7% of recent applicants did not respond or answered "don't know" to the evaluation questions. If these applicants are eliminated from the analysis, as they are in the rest of this section, satisfaction levels naturally change. Of those rendering an opinion of the evaluative dimension, 60.0% found agencies "very" helpful, an increase of 3.1%, while 60.2% found them "very" fair and 64.9% "very" considerate, increases of roughly 4%.

Generally high percentages of satisfaction hold for every sub-category of applicant. Figure 7 shows that <u>in every social, economic and demographic group save one, more than half the contacts reported that agencies were "very" helpful, fair or considerate</u>. (The one exception was trivial: "only" 49.5% of black and Hispanic men reported "very" fair evaluations.) Moreover the level of applicants reporting agencies were "not at all" helpful, fair or considerate rarely rose over 20%. The worst

evaluation given for any group on any dimension was among those who needed personal care, that is, those not capable of independent living: 27.3% judged their encounters as "not at all" fair. Thus evaluations can be summarized as mostly positive, as measured both by the regularly high percentages of "very" satisfied responses and the absence of isolated high percentages of "not at all" responses.

In the main, the same groups of applicants reported that agencies were "very" helpful, fair or considerate, although evaluations for helpful were usually slightly less favorable than for fair and considerate. Age, education, and race had a decided effect on all three evaluative dimensions. Figure 7 shows that for each evaluation variable satisfaction rose with age, declined with education, and whites were more favorably disposed than blacks and Hispanics. Applicants aged 65 or older and those with eight or fewer grades education were 10% to 20% more positive in their evaluations than applicants under age 31 or having at least some post-secondary education. As was the case with receiving benefits or services, whites were at least 12% more satisfied with their bureaucratic encounters than blacks and Hispanics.

The inability to live an independent life as represented by those needing personal care had a negative effect on evaluations of agency helpfulness and fairness. More than a quarter of this group found agencies "not at all" helpful or fair, perhaps because public programs do not adequately respond in benefits or services to the wide range of needs of those who must have constant attention. In fact, 83.3% of those requiring personal care had applied to more than one agency and 27.8% required two

or more trips to complete their applications. The burden of multiple help-seeking endeavors and numerous trips to complete claims may be a source of negative applicant evaluations.

Race and income effects on agency evaluation were most pronounced when assessing agency fairness. About 12% more whites than blacks and Hispanics evaluated agencies "very" helpful or "very" considerate. On the fair dimension, however, 68.6% of whites compared to 50.9% of blacks and Hispanics judged agencies as "very" fair, a difference of almost 18%. Lower black and Hispanic evaluations of agency fairness were not a function of lower levels of receiving benefits or services. For every category of status of benefits substantially lower percentages of blacks and Hispanics reported that agencies were "very" fair. As was the case with nearly equal rejection rates for whites, blacks and Hispanics, both groups had approximately equal percentages of applicants in the most negative evaluative categories. Thus, just as agencies may have been obstructing the applications of minorities, minorities appeared to be equivocating on positively evaluating their bureaucratic experiences.

Perception of fairness rose steadily as income rose, a finding which remained constant regardless of whether or not an applicant was receiving benefits. Approximately 75% of those whose total family income in 1972 was $15,000 or more found agencies "very" fair, and only 3.6% found them "not at all" fair. On the other hand, 61.9% of those whose income was $5,000 or less found agencies "very" fair and 12.7% found them "not at all" fair. These findings are particularly interesting in light of the fact that the well-to-do are not more successful at receiving

benefits. In such a situation, the positive evaluations of agency fairness by the wealthy might be described as "the rich feel better even if they do not do better."

In terms of the impact of goal-directed variables, status of application had the most profound effect on user evaluations. In fact, no other social or goal-oriented variable more strongly distinguished between satisfaction and dissatisfaction than status of application. Figure 8 shows that over 70% of those who received benefits or services judged their contacts as "very" helpful, fair or considerate, whereas only 8.0% judged them "very" helpful, 18.6% judged them "very" fair and 31.3% judged them "very" considerate if applications were rejected. Simply put, applicants liked their encounters if they received benefits or services and did not think well of them at all if they were rejected.

Similarly, if other help-seeking goals were met, applicants also rendered positive evaluations. Those who were treated well in the application process as measured by receiving the "correct" amount of assistance in presenting a claim evaluated their encounters highly: at least 62% reported "very" helpful, fair or considerate experiences. The passed-over group, that is, those who reported needing but not receiving claims assistance were quite dissatisfied: 55.4% found agencies "not at all" helpful, 50.0% "not at all" fair, and 37.0% "not at all" considerate. On the other hand, agency solicitousness elicited highly positive responses, at least 73% of applicants receiving extra claims assistance were located in the "very" category for each evaluation measure and less than 3% reported "not at all"

Second, the difference in positive evaluation between the routinized Old Age and Survivor program in the Social Security Administration and the SSA's less routinized Disability Program was particularly striking when evaluating agency fairness. Over 84% of applicants to the Old Age and Survivors Program judged it "very" fair compared with 67.5% of Disability Program applicants. This suggests that applicants cognizant of the difficulties in applying and inequities arising from disability entitlement rules and their application. Dissatisfaction with fairness may also be caused by the severity of the disability required to receive Social Security Disability benefits: an individual must be permanently and totally disabled from any work in the national economy.

Third, those applicants who were markedly negative in evaluating agency helpfulness, i.e., applicants to social service and benefit-in-kind programs, were much more positive about the consideration of agency personnel, though still not as positive as those approaching monetary-benefit programs. For example, 55.6% of those applying for low cost or public housing responded that the agency was "very" considerate, compared to 37.5% who responded that the agency was "very" helpful. This indicates that applicants distinguished between the content of evaluative dimensions.

As the comparison between the Old Age and Survivors and Disability programs in the Social Security Administration demonstrates, routinized agencies and programs were quite positively evaluated. Figure 8 shows that four-fifths of the contacts to routinized agencies or programs found them very considerate, with very

positive evaluations somewhat lower for helpful (75.3%) and fair (76.9%). All the routinized agencies and programs are federally run insurance programs. As the much lower federal-state insurance program evaluations show, it is not the social legitimacy of insurance programs per se which leads to positive evaluations. Remarkably, Federal-State insurance and welfare programs were almost identical in their evaluations: roughly 60% of applicants to these agencies found them "very" helpful, fair or considerate. Taken as a whole, the findings ought to be both a caution and a goad to welfare reformers, signifying that welfare would not only need to be federalized, but also routinized in decision rules and unified in delivery to elicit the positive evaluations associated with federal insurance programs. Advocates of vocational program change might also heed this warning.

For the fair and considerate dimensions, vocational patterns of satisfaction mirror federal-state insurance and welfare benefits. However, vocational program applicants reported low levels of agency helpfulness. Only 38.1% found agencies very helpful and 35.6% found them not at all helpful. Many critics[10] condemn public job placement programs as being unimportant in finding jobs. Employers are not required to list jobs with them, and many white collar jobs would never be listed there. Similarly, vocational rehabilitation and job training programs have been faulted for training people for limited advancement jobs, as well as training them poorly. It is not surprising then that vocational programs which are represented as discovering aptitude, teaching skills, or locating positions are judged negatively when

those services are not provided well.

The final objective of the research is to ascertain the mix of social, economic, demographic and goal-oriented variables determining applicant satisfaction with public social agencies. Three pieces of information were sought. First, we were interested in determining the percentage of variance explained by using all types of independent variables. Second, we were interested in determining the relative importance of the variables affecting satisfaction, having previously hypothesized that goal-oriented variables would be more important. To acquire these two pieces of information we built an analysis of variance model of applicant of satisfaction for each evaluation dimension. Third, we were interested in knowing how accurate the models of applicant satisfaction were in predicting the known evaluations of applicants in this sample. This information gives political scientists and policy analysts insight into the potential future use of these variables in determining applicant satisfaction.

To determine the percentage variance explained and relative importance of the variables we employed the General Linear Model for each dependent variable using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computational package. In the creation of each applicant satisfaction model, we used a two-category dependent variable, eliminating from analysis all applications whose evaluation fell in the "somewhat" category. This procedure was employed because the three-category division of responses for the helpful, fair, and considerate variables posed several analysis problems. Crosstabular analysis showed that applicants rendering "somewhat" positive evaluations were similar to

applicants rendering "very" positive evaluations. Clearly, both categories elicited favorable responses to bureaucratic experiences. The purpose of the model, however, was to determine the antecedents of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The inclusion of the "somewhats" either as a separate group or coded with the "very's" tended to weaken the model building. The strongest model resulted when using only the two extreme categories -- "very" and "not at all" -- in the dependent variables. As shall be discussed below, the models of applicant satisfaction using the extreme categories dependent variables placed at least four-fifths of the "somewhats" in the "very" satisfied category. This suggests that applicants reporting "some(what)" satisfaction were indeed merely weaker versions of those "very" satisfied. Future research may want to employ two-category forced choice questions in determining applicant satisfaction.

For each dependent variable we ran a three-iteration analysis of variance, initially using each social and goal-oriented variable and all the first-order interactions. Insignificant effects were removed at each iteration until at the third iteration the most parsimonious model resulted. The sums of squares were computed eliminating extra explained variance due to multicollinearity, a technique necessary with the intercorrelated independent variables prevalent in social science research. Variables were eliminated from the analysis when the probability of the F statistic was greater than or equal to 0.05. The data set for this analysis had 1,262 cases, the "somewhats"

having been removed as were all missing observations for all variables used in any of the equations. For comparability the models were built on exactly equivalent data sets.

Initial analysis of variance employed the following variables: age, sex, race, income, education, independent living,[11] status of application, claims assistance, residual demand, type of agency,[12] number of agencies contacted, and number of trips necessary to complete the application. Only five main effects and seven of their first order interaction effects were used in creating the three models. Because most of the independent variables were categorical, and to eliminate problems with excessive degrees of freedom, most variables were collapsed for the analysis of variance. Status of application was divided into receiving benefits or services, awaiting commencement and under consideration versus rejection. Claims assistance remained in its three code form: more than, the right amount and less claims assistance than was felt necessary. Agencies were coded by major principle of entitlement: insurance, welfare or vocational. Education had two categories, one for 11 or fewer years of education, and the other for 12 or more years. Income was divided into three groups: $0-$3,499; $3,500-$4,999; and $5,000 and above.

Two important findings emerge from the analysis of variance, the first concerning the percentage of variance explained and the second concerning the relative contribution of variables within each model. As seen in Figures 10a, 10b, and 10c, we were most successful in accounting for variance in the model for helpfulness. Thirty-eight percent of the variance was explained compared to 28% for fair and 20% for considerate. The higher

explained variances for helpfulness is not surprising given that this term is most precise and concrete.

In each model, however, the two most powerful variables were status of application and claims assistance. In terms of the contribution to total variance explained (as measured by sums of squares) or the relative power of sums of squares for each degree of freedom (as measured by the mean square) these two goal-oriented variables were more powerful than any social, economic, or demographic variable. These findings support in part the hypothesis that goal-oriented variables are most useful in determining applicant satisfaction.

We qualify the findings relating goal-oriented variables and satisfaction because only two of the five proposed goal-oriented variables were routinely important in explaining satisfaction. Being treated as deserving of public aid as measured by type of agency contacted was only important in explaining helpfulness, however the interaction of type of agency with status of application and claims assistance added to the explanation of agency fairness. Achieving closure on one's problems as measured by reporting no residual need, did not significantly affect applicant satisfaction.

Of the social, economic and demographic variables only education and income were individually important in explaining satisfaction, although these variables and race interacted with goal-oriented variables in the models of fairness and consideration. Surprisingly, neither age nor any interaction with age was significant in the multivariate analysis.

Our final objective in examining the multivariate sources

of applicant satisfaction was to determine how correctly the equations classified applicants into their known categories of evaluation. This procedure gives us another type of information, allowing us to gage which satisfaction groups we were most successfully explaining.[13] Figure 11 reports that the equations were remarkably successful at correctly classifying those who are very satisfied. More than 97% of applicants who found agencies "very" helpful, fair or considerate were correctly classified by the equations. At least 85% of the "somewhats" were classified as "very's" by each satisfaction equation, supporting crosstabular evidence showing that "somewhats" hold similar but less intense beliefs than "very's."

The models were less successful at correctly classifying applicants into the "not at all" categories: 58.1% of the "not at alls" were correctly classified in the helpful model, 54.4% in the fair model and 34.7% in the considerate model. In other words, the models correctly classified applicants dissatisfied with agency helpfulness slightly better than chance, roughly equivalent to chance for fairness and were quite unsuccessful in ascertaining who really felt agencies were inconsiderate. Part of explanation for the differences in correct classification is the small size of the "not at all" groups, especially for the considerate variable. In terms of interpretation, the enormous success in classifying satisfied applicants coupled with lower success in classifying dissatisfied suggests that applicants are satisfied for one pattern of reasons mainly depending on meeting their help-seeking goals, whereas there may be a thousand reasons for dissatisfaction.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this research was to investigate the sources of applicant satisfaction with public social benefit and service programs. Prior research had emphasized the importance of personal characteristics in applicant satisfaction. To extend that research, we added the assumption that help-seeking is an instrumental, goal-oriented behavior. We then hypothesized that applicants who met their help-seeking goals would more positively evaluate agency helpfulness, fairness and consideration than those whose goals were not met. Five help-seeking goals were presented, primary among them, receiving benefits or services. Other goals included being treated well in the application process, approaching or achieving closure on one's problems, facing reasonable, routinized decision rules and being treated as deserving of public aid. This view of help-seeking makes satisfaction dependent on agency response. Thus we needed to know not only which types of applicants were satisfied, but also which applicants went to which agencies and how well they fared.

The analysis was conducted using a subset of the "Service Organizations and the Public" data collected in 1972. In a nationwide sample of 6,493 respondents, 2,504 reported ever having applied to one or more of the sixteen major social programs in America (see Page 6). These 2,505 individuals made 3,432 applications for benefits or services, 1,564 during the year prior to being interviewed. These 1,564 applications constituted the data set for this analysis. One should note that the unit of analysis was applications not individuals.

In brief, we found that different types of applicants were indeed tracked to different types of agencies. The aged, the wealthy and the well-educated more frequently applied to federal insurance programs. Whites more frequently applied to insurance programs and blacks and Hispanics to welfare and vocational agencies.

In terms of who received benefits or services, three findings are particularly noteworthy. The analysis found high levels of success in getting help overall: 73.7% of applicants received benefits or services, with only 10.6% being rejected outright. The other 15.7% of applicants were accepted and waiting for services to begin, or had claims under adjudication. However, white applicants, the elderly, those seeking insurance or welfare benefits, and those receiving a sufficient amount of assistance in presenting their help-seeking claims were more successful than blacks, young people, vocational applicants, or those who felt they were passed over in receiving claims assistance.

The findings on higher levels of receiving benefits among whites bear further comments. Although 65.3% of blacks and Hispanics received benefits and services compared to 76.2% of whites, rejection rates were roughly equal: 13.1% for blacks and Hispanics, and 9.9% for whites. Racism is a frequent charge in social programs, yet these findings did not seem classically racist. Rather, minorities did as badly as whites, but not as well. If racism was at work, it was revealed in the slow-down of minority applications, as noted by the large percentage of applicants in the "waiting" and "being adjudicated" categories.

This racial pattern to obtaining benefits did not alter appreciably when controlled for type of agency or education. The findings linking race and receiving benefits are particularly of interest when noting that increasing income or education, two other measures of social privilege, had no effect on receiving benefits. If racism is at work through a slowdown of minority applications, it is not obviously supported by classism.

As previous research has shown, Americans are rather satisfied with their bureaucratic encounters. At least 55% of applicants found agencies "very" helpful, fair, or considerate, as measured on a three point scale. The highest level of negative evaluation was found on the helpful dimension: 16.5% found agencies "not at all" helpful, compared to 9.9% for fair and 8.8% for considerate. At least 50% of every social, economic and demographic group also found agencies "very" helpful, fair, or considerate. Satisfaction increased with age and decreased with education for each evaluative dimension. Although income had no effect on perception of helpfulness and consideration, it was positively associated with perceptions of agency fairness. As wealth had no effect on actually obtaining benefits or services, this finding may be described as "the rich <u>feel</u> better even if they do not <u>do</u> better."

Goal-oriented variables were more forceful predictors of satisfaction than social, economic and demographic variables as shown both by crosstabular analysis and analysis of variance. In crosstabular analysis, we found support for the hypothesis that those who met their help-seeking goals would be more satisfied with the bureaucratic encounter than those who did not. In

fact, receiving benefits was the strongest single predictor of applicant satisfaction for each evaluative dimension. Likewise, applicants were decidedly more satisfied when treated well in presenting their claims, when they expressed no residual need for benefits or services, when they approached agencies with routinized decision procedures, and when agencies were structured so as to make applicants feel they were deserving of aid.

The ultimate objective of this research was to investigate the relative importance of goal-oriented and personal characteristics in determing applicant satisfaction. An analysis of variance model of applicant satisfaction was built for each of the three evaluation dimensions. In each model, receiving benefits and obtaining adequate assistance in claims presentation were the most important variables contributing more to the variance explained than all other variables (r^2 = 0.38 for helpful, 0.28 for fair, and 0.20 for considerate). Surprisingly, education and income were the important personal variables in the multivariate analysis, with race somewhat important in perceptions of agency consideration, and age not important in any model. Equations from the models correctly classified at least 97% of applicants in the "very" category for each satisfaction dimension. The equations were less successful in correctly classifying applicants who found their experiences "not at all" acceptable: 58.1% of the "not at all's" were correctly classified by the "helpful" equation, 54.4% by the "fair" equation, and 34.7% for the "considerate" equation. The small size of the "not at all" groups accounts in part for the poorer correct classification for this group. However, the combined pattern of almost perfect

success in classifying very satisfied applicants, and lower success in classifying dissatisfied applicants suggests that there is one pattern for good feelings based mainly on achieving one's goals, and a thousand reasons for ill-will.

The analysis has quite firmly shown that satisfaction with encounters with public social benefit and service agencies rests primarily on receiving benefits or services and obtaining sufficient assistance in claims presentation. These findings take us beyond a portrait of satisfied applicants, indeed they unveil the dynamics of why particular groups of applicants were more satisfied than others, and allow us to talk about revamping delivery systems in a manner precluded by analysis of personal characteristics.

We are left with several questions about how to interpret these findings. We want to know, for example, what it is about getting benefits or services that is so powerful in producing applicant satisfaction. We also want to examine the question of how favorable ought applicant evaluations of bureaucratic encounters be. Last, we want to speculate on the political implications of organizational sources of satisfaction with help-seeking encounters.

High levels of satisfaction among applicants to social programs seem somewhat incongruous in an era where evaluations of other public institutions are declining in the minds of most Americans. Indeed, examined closely, high levels of applicant satisfaction seem themselves incongruous given low levels of benefits received. Satisfaction, then, is not understood merely by receiving benefits, but through the total context of the

help-seeking. We can image that it is the mix of (sometimes grudging) gratitude, dependency, and lack of alternative which makes receiving benefits or services so pleasing.

For the question, "how favorable is favorable enough", society must weigh value of reducing very negative evaluations by the cost of providing more benefits or services. One of the often unstated ideals of American democracy has been the neutral and efficient functioning of bureaucracies. We may be able to absorb the fluctuations in the popularity of leaders precisely because we know we can "turn them out." We may need very successful institutions, however, to provide the glue which keeps political life together through regime changes.

Is 15% applicants with negative evaluations of public programs (as is the case of agency helpfulness) an acceptably low level of disaffection? The well-to-do may think that 15% negative responses is a measure of very effective bureaucratic measures, perhaps even bureaucracies which are "too soft," whereas poorer applicants may feel just the opposite. The answer is certainly open to debate. Whatever side one picks in the debate, however, all would agree that 15% is more acceptable if those applicants are randomly distributed through groups of applicants and types of organizational experience, or if concentrated, then focused on the less needy. In reality, negative evaluations are concentrated not so much among the most needy, but among those groups which have the least socially legitimate claim on public aid: blacks and Hispanics, and young people. These applicants approach agencies whose structure and processes reflect their underclass position: i.e., welfare and vocational

programs where human judgment is more likely to be a factor in entitlement decisions. Moreover, applicants in these situations are less likely to obtain assistance in claims presentation and improve their chances of receiving benefits.

Thus, the most important conclusion we can draw from the link between getting benefits and adequate claims assistance and agency evaluations is that there are organizational mechanisms for improving satisfaction. Society does not have to wait for the young to grow old to enjoy positive evaluations of bureaucracy. Rather, agencies can be altered, reformed if one likes, to improve levels of receiving benefits and provide more information and assistance in application procedure. It may seem that the only way to improve levels of receiving benefits or services comes from relaxing stringent eligibility roles and spending more money. This, perhaps, is the more humane method, even if it conjures managerial nightmares for bureaucrats. But routinizing the rules, by making them more clear cut and publicizing them well within and outside organizations, that is, making structure of all help-giving organizations parallel those serving the most legitimate applicants, might accomplish similar ends. All that is necessary, and so plainly lacking, is the political will.

References

[1]Daniel Katz, et al., Bureaucratic Encounters: A Pilot Study in the Evaluation of Government Services (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1975) and Charles T. Goodsell, "Client Evaluation of the Bureaucratic Encounter: A Comparative Study of Welfare Programs," paper presented at the August 30-September 3, 1978 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York City. Forty-five years ago Gabriel Almond and Harold D. Hasswell published an early article on the politics of help-seeking in their "Aggressive Behavior by Clients Toward Public Administrators: A Configurative Analysis," American Political Science Review, Vol. 28 (August 1934), pp. 643-655. Other general work on help-seeking from public social programs includes: Morris Janowitz, et al., Public Administration and the Public: Perspectives Toward Government in a Metropolitan Community (Ann Arbor: Bureau of Government, Institute of Public Administration, 1958); Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965), pp. 68-78; Herbert Jacob, "Contact with Government Agencies: A Preliminary Analysis of the Distribution of Governmental Service," Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. 16 (February 1972), pp. 132-146; Robert L. Kahn, et al., "Americans Love Their Bureaucrats," Psychology Today (June 1975), pp. 66-71; Robert G. Lehnen, "Citizen Interaction with Public Agencies. Some Causes and Consequences of Individual Participation," paper presented at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, California, Sept. 2-5, 1975; Barbara J. Nelson, "On Becoming a Client: Authoritative Help-Seeking as Dependent Participation," paper presented at the X World Congress of the International Political Science Association, Edinburgh, Scotland, August 16-21, 1976; Carolyn K. Ban and Barbara J. Nelson, "Decisions by Line Bureaucrats. Do Sex and Race Affect the Results of Applications for Public Social Benefits or Services?," paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1-4, 1977; Henry Dietz, "Bureaucrat-Client Interactions as Politics: Experiences and Perceptions of the Urban Poor in an Authoritarian Context," paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention, New York City, August 30-September 3, 1978; and Virginia Ermers, "Bureaucratic-Clientele Encounters: Female Police Officers and the Public," paper presented at the American Political Science Association Convention, New York City, August 30-September 3, 1978.

[2]Katz, et al., op. cit., pp. 63-64; and Goodsell, op. cit., p. 14.

[3]Katz, et al., op. cit., pp. 63-101.

[4]Ibid., p. 99.

[5]U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 119 "Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1977," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, p. 2.

[6]On the issue of the validity of eligibility rules in social programs, see: Saad Z. Nagi, "Gatekeeping Decisions in Service Organizations: When Validity Fails," Human Organization, Vol. 33 (Spring 1974), pp. 47-58.

[7]This author has found that the major gatekeeper to public social programs is not rejection, but self-selection. In 1972, almost three times as many people refrained from contacting agencies when they felt they could have used help than were actually rejected after applying. See: Barbara J. Nelson, Residual Demand for Services: Internalized Gatekeeping and Self-Selection Out of the Public Social Benefits System in America (doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State State University, 1976).

[8]Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare (New York: Vintage Books, 1971); and Nick Kotz and Mary Lynn Kotz, A Passion for Equality: George A. Wiley and the Movement (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1977).

[9]Henry J. Aaron, Shelter Subsidies: Who Benefits from Federal Housing Policy (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1972) and Elizabeth Roistacher, "Housing and Homeownership" in James N. Morgan (ed.), Five Thousand American Families -- Patterns of Economic Progress, Vol. 2, Special Studies of the First Five Years of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1974), pp. 1-40.

[10]Sar A. Levitan and Robert Taggart III, Employment and Earnings Inadequacy (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974); Leonard P. Adams, The Public Employment Service in Transition, 1933-1968 (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1969); and Lloyd G. Reynolds, Labor Economics and Labor Relations (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 145-157.

[11]The Work Disability Index was not used in the analysis of variance because it was computed only for applicants under age 65.

[12]The "routinization" variable was not used in the analysis of variance because both it and the "type of agency" variable were created from the same source, the agencies applicants

contacted. Early analysis indicated that type of agency was more predictive than routinization.

[13]This procedure employed the equations created by the whole data set to predict classification for the whole data set, yielding the highest levels of correct classification. Future research will use a split sample methodology, creating the equations with one randomly determined half of the sample and predicting on the other half.

Appendix A

Creation of the Work Disability Index[1]

The Work Disability Index was created to assess performance in the roles and activities associated with employment outside the home, homemaking, and attending school. The Index was based on the actual work history of respondents and reported difficulties in meeting the requirements of their roles in current and previous jobs. Scores were computed only for persons between 18 and 64. The Index comprised three levels:

> *No Work Disability:* Persons who are working regularly in jobs (36 hours or more), housekeeping, or school work, and reported no limitations in current or previous work.
>
> *Limited in Work Roles and Activities:* Persons who are working regularly in jobs, housekeeping, or in school, but reported difficulties in performing their current work or a change in jobs because of disability.
>
> *Vocationally Disabled:* Persons who are out of the labor market because of being disabled; are below 65 and have retired or left their last employment because of disability; or who cannot perform housekeeping or school work. This category includes a small number of persons who, because of health problems, were working on a limited part-time basis.

---

[1]The description of the Work Disability Index is excerpted from: Saad Z. Nagi, "An Epidemiology of Disability Among Adults in the United States," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly: Health and Society, Vol. 54 (Fall 1976), pp. 443-444.

Appendix B

Creation of the Independent Living Index[1]

The Independent Living Index was based on a series of questions addressing the need for help in looking after personal needs such as dressing, bathing, eating, and other daily activities; the need for help in going outside the residence; and the need for help in shopping and household chores. This Independent Living Index was constructed for all persons in the sample (18 and over) who were grouped into four categories:

> *No Limitations:* Persons who reported no significant difficulty in walking, going up or down stairs, stooping, bending or kneeling, handling and fingering, reaching, and who were neither blind nor deaf.
>
> *Limited but Independent:* Persons who reported significant difficulty in walking, using stairs, stooping, bending or kneeling, handling or fingering, reaching, or who were blind or deaf, but who require no assistance in community living.
>
> *Needing Assistance in Mobility:* Persons requiring assistance in mobility outside the home or residence; they were also persons who needed assistance in housekeeping, work, and shopping.
>
> *Needing Assistance in Personal Care:* Persons requiring assistance in activities of daily living such as clothing, feeding, and personal hygiene.

---

[1]The description of the Independent Living Index is excerpted from: Saad Z. Nagi, "An Epidemiology of Disability Among Adults in the United States," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly: Health and Society, Vol. 54 (Fall 1976), pp. 444-445.

Figure 1.

Comparison of Prevalence and Incidence Patterns of Service and Benefit Utilization

(Source: "Service Organization and the Public" Data)

Agency or Program	Prevalence Population (ever contacted an agency) (N = 3443)[1]	Incidence Population (contacted agency within year of interview) (N = 1564)[1,2]
Social Security Administration	38.5	15.0
State or Local Public Assistance Programs	11.5	12.3
Veterans Administration	9.2	9.1
Unemployment Compensation	9.1	18.6
Food Stamps	7.9	12.7
Employment and Job Placement Services	4.9	10.4
Low-Cost or Public Housing	4.0	4.2
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	3.0	3.6
Programs for Pensions or Disability Benefits for Government Employees	2.8	1.1
Workers Compensation	1.7	3.4
Railroad Retirement and Disability Benefits	1.3	0.3
Legal Aid Societies or Programs	1.2	2.5
Job Training Programs	0.9	1.8
Aid to the Blind and Disabled	0.9	0.6
Vocational Rehabilitation Services	0.8	1.2
State Programs for Sickness or Temporary Disability	0.5	0.8
Other Agencies	1.8	2.6
Missing Data[3]	0.0	0.0[3]

[1]The unit of analysis is applications, not individuals. See the text on page 7 for a further explanation.

[2]The incidence population is used in this analysis.

[3]In the incidence population, one applicant did not respond with the name of the agency contacted, i.e., n = 1 for missing data.

Figure 2.

What Type of Applicants Contact Which Type of Agencies[1,2]

	Federal Insurance	Federal-State Insurance	Welfare	Vocational	(N)
Age					
30 and under	21.1	23.2	36.5	19.2	(620)
31-40	18.3	25.4	44.2	12.1	(240)
41-50	21.7	26.1	35.2	17.0	(230)
51-64	33.2	26.1	34.2	6.5	(307)
65 and older	66.9	6.6	25.3	1.2	(166)
Gamma = -0.27					
Race and Sex					
White Men	33.0	33.0	20.2	13.8	(585)
White Women	29.7	18.8	40.4	11.2	(607)
Black and Hispanic Men	22.9	18.6	39.8	18.6	(118)
Black and Hispanic Women	13.4	8.6	62.5	15.5	(232)
Gamma = 0.26					
Total Family Income					
Under $5,000	22.2	11.4	52.8	13.6	(634)
$5,000-$9,999	25.6	28.2	32.2	14.0	(450)
$10,000-$14,999	35.4	38.0	16.2	10.3	(271)
$15,000 and over	44.8	29.0	8.3	17.9	(145)
Gamma = -0.28					
Education					
8 grades or less	28.9	17.3	47.3	6.5	(336)
9-11 grades	22.4	22.6	43.5	11.5	(393)
12 grades	26.7	30.0	30.2	13.2	(454)
13 or more grades	34.9	19.3	24.1	21.7	(378)
Independent Living Index					
No Limitations	26.5	24.8	34.9	13.8	(1302)
Limited but Independent	35.7	14.3	37.0	13.0	(154)
Needs Mobility Assistance	38.0	8.5	50.7	2.8	(71)
Needs Personal Care	30.6	13.9	36.1	19.4	(36)
Work Disability Index					
None	23.3	26.1	34.6	16.0	(1107)
Limited	21.5	29.2	43.1	6.2	(65)
Disabled	24.4	16.4	47.6	11.6	(225)
65 or older	66.9	6.6	25.3	1.2	(166)

[1]All distributions in this table are significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

[2]The Work Disability Index was not calculated for applicants 65 or older.

Figure 3.

Social Composition of Types of Agencies[1]

	Federal Insurance	Federal-State Insurance	Welfare	Vocational
Age				
30 and under	29.9	40.4	40.4	56.9
31-40	10.0	17.1	18.9	13.9
41-50	11.4	16.9	14.5	18.7
51-64	23.3	22.5	18.8	9.6
65 and older	25.3	3.1	7.5	1.0
(N)	(438)	(356)	(560)	(209)
Race and Sex				
White Men	44.8	55.3	21.3	39.1
White Women	41.8	32.7	44.1	32.9
Black and Hispanic Men	6.3	6.3	8.5	10.6
Black and Hispanic Women	7.2	5.7	26.1	17.4
(N)	(431)	(349)	(555)	(207)
Total Family Income				
Under $5,000	33.8	20.9	62.5	42.4
$5,000-$9,999	27.6	36.9	27.1	31.0
$10,000-$14,999	23.0	29.9	8.2	13.8
$15,000 and over	15.6	12.2	2.2	12.8
(N)	(417)	(344)	(536)	(203)
Education				
8 grades or less	22.1	16.3	28.5	10.5
9-11 grades	20.1	25.0	30.6	21.5
12 grades	27.6	38.2	24.6	28.7
13 or more grades	30.1	20.5	16.3	39.2
(N)	(438)	(356)	(558)	(209)
Independent Living Index				
No Limitations	78.8	90.7	81.1	86.1
Limited but Independent	12.6	6.2	10.2	9.6
Needs Mobility Assistance	6.2	1.7	6.4	1.0
Needs Personal Care	2.5	1.4	2.3	3.3
(N)	(438)	(356)	(560)	(209)
Work Disability Index				
None	59.9	81.2	68.4	84.7
Limited	3.2	5.3	5.0	1.9
Disabled	12.6	10.4	19.1	12.4
65 or older[2]	25.3	3.1	7.5	1.0
(N)	(438)	(356)	(560)	(209)

[1] All distributions in this table are significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

[2] The Work Disability Index was not calculated for applicants age 65 or older.

Figure 4.

What Type of Applicants Receive Benefits or Services?

	Received Benefits	Accepted, Waiting for Services	Application Being Considered	Application Rejected	(N)
Age[1]					
30 and under	72.0	8.9	9.3	9.8	(583)
31-40	73.9	10.4	4.3	11.3	(230)
41-50	70.8	8.7	6.4	14.2	(219)
51-64	72.4	10.1	7.4	10.1	(297)
65 and older	85.5	2.4	3.0	9.0	(166)
Race and Sex[1]					
White Men	76.4	8.4	6.4	8.9	(550)
White Women	76.0	7.8	5.3	10.9	(588)
Black and Hispanic Men	64.3	9.8	16.1	9.8	(112)
Black and Hispanic Women	65.8	11.6	8.0	14.7	(225)
Total Family Income[2]					
Under $5,000	74.6	7.5	6.4	11.5	(611)
$5,000-$9,999	72.5	9.2	6.7	11.5	(433)
$10,000-$14,999	74.8	9.1	7.1	9.1	(254)
$15,000 and over	70.8	11.7	8.8	8.8	(137)
Education[2]					
8 grades or less	75.1	6.3	8.7	9.9	(333)
9-11 grades	76.0	7.9	5.4	10.6	(367)
12 grades	72.0	10.6	6.0	11.5	(436)
13 or more grades	72.0	9.2	8.4	10.4	(537)
Independent Living Index[1]					
No Limitations	74.4	9.0	7.1	9.5	(1242)
Limited, but Independent	70.7	8.8	6.8	13.6	(147)
Needs Mobility Assistance	77.1	4.3	2.9	15.7	(70)
Needs Personal Care	55.6	2.8	13.9	27.8	(36)
Work Disability Index[1]					
None	73.1	9.8	6.7	10.3	(1046)
Limited	77.4	4.8	4.8	12.9	(62)
Disabled	66.5	8.6	12.2	12.7	(221)
65 or older	85.5	2.4	3.0	9.0	(166)
Type of Agency[1]					
Federal Insurance	75.4	7.7	7.9	9.0	(431)
Federal-State Insurance	79.7	5.6	5.3	9.4	(340)
Welfare	77.0	4.9	4.9	13.1	(549)
Vocational	47.1	28.7	14.9	9.2	(174)
Assistance in Presenting Claim[1]					
Extra Assistance	80.8	10.3	7.1	1.9	(156)
Amount Wanted	75.7	8.4	6.9	9.0	(1179)
Too Little Assistance	41.6	8.8	9.7	39.8	(113)
Gamma = 0.43	73.6	8.6	7.1	10.6	(1448)
Residual Need for Services[2]					
Yes	71.1	9.2	5.3	14.5	(152)
No	74.1	8.5	7.3	10.1	(1336)
Routinization[2]					
Routine	76.2	7.7	7.7	8.4	(391)
Non-Routine	72.7	9.1	6.8	11.5	(1091)
Number of Agencies Contacted[2]					
One (1)	76.2	7.7	6.2	10.0	(713)
2 or more	71.5	9.5	7.8	11.3	(782)
Number of Trips to Complete Application[2]					
0	72.3	9.5	7.3	10.9	(220)
1	73.2	8.6	7.2	11.0	(637)
2	75.1	7.9	7.6	9.4	(277)
3 or more	73.0	9.1	6.4	11.5	(296)

[1]These distributions are significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

[2]These distributions are not significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

Figure 5.

Status of Applications Within Individual Agencies and Programs[1]

Agency or Program	(N)	Received Benefits	Accepted, Waiting for Services	Application Being Considered	Application Rejected
All Agencies	(1494)	73.7	8.6	7.0	10.6
Social Security Administration	(229)	76.9	6.1	7.4	9.6
Veterans Administration	(141)	74.5	9.9	8.5	7.1
Unemployment Compensation	(276)	77.9	6.5	5.1	10.5
Food Stamps	(196)	82.7	2.6	2.0	12.8
Employment and Job Placement Services	(131)	46.6	30.5	14.5	8.4
Low Cost or Public Housing	(59)	42.4	23.7	15.3	18.6
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	(55)	87.3	1.8	3.6	7.3
State or Local Public Assistance	(191)	79.1	3.7	5.2	12.0
Programs for Pensions or Disability Benefits for Government Employees	(17)	76.5	11.8	5.9	5.9
Workers Compensation	(52)	88.5	1.9	5.8	3.8
Railroad Retirement and Disability Benefits	(4)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Legal Aid Societies or Programs	(38)	76.3	0.0	2.6	21.1
Job Training Programs	(25)	44.5	28.0	28.5	8.0
Aid to Blind or Disabled	(9)	77.8	0.0	11.1	11.1
Vocational Rehabilitation Services	(18)	55.6	16.7	11.1	16.7
State Programs for Sickness or Temporary Disability	(12)	83.3	0.0	8.3	8.3
Other Agencies	(40)	67.5	7.5	10.0	15.0

[1]The distribution is significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

Figure 6.

Frequency Distribution for Agency Helpfulness, Fairness and Consideration

Presented With and Without Missing Data

	Helpful		Fair		Considerate	
	Without Missing Data	With Missing Data	Without Missing Data	With Missing Data	Without Missing Data	With Missing Data
Very	60.0	56.9	64.7	60.2	64.9	60.4
Somewhat	22.6	21.5	24.7	23.0	25.7	23.9
Not At All	17.4	16.5	10.6	9.9	9.5	8.8
Don't Know, No Response	--	5.1	--	6.8	--	6.8
(N)	(1484)	(1564)	(1457)	(1564)	(1457)	(1564)

Figure 7.

The Relationship between Social, Economic and Demographic Variables and Three Measures of Applicant Satisfaction.

	Helpful				Fair				Considerate			
	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)
Age												
30 and under	53.5	26.8	19.7	(593)	59.2	12.8	10.9	(586)	56.5	31.7	11.8	(575)
31-40	58.1	22.3	19.7	(229)	60.6	26.5	12.8	(226)	65.3	23.9	10.8	(222)
41-50	62.4	18.1	19.5	(210)	66.2	22.9	11.0	(210)	68.4	23.3	8.4	(215)
51-64	64.6	21.4	13.9	(294)	69.8	21.0	9.3	(281)	71.4	22.4	6.2	(290)
65 and older	75.3	15.8	8.9	(158)	79.9	11.7	8.4	(154)	78.1	15.5	6.4	(155)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01			
Race and Sex												
White Men	62.3	20.1	17.6	(551)	67.8	23.0	9.2	(544)	64.8	25.9	9.2	(532)
White Women	62.7	21.8	15.6	(585)	69.2	19.7	11.1	(569)	70.4	21.1	8.5	(574)
Black and Hispanic Men	50.5	32.1	17.4	(109)	49.5	41.1	9.3	(107)	52.7	38.2	9.1	(110)
Black and Hispanic Women	52.0	25.8	22.2	(221)	51.6	33.8	14.6	(219)	56.1	28.0	13.5	(223)
	X^2 significant at p<0.05				X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01			
Total Family Income												
Under $5,000	61.2	21.8	16.9	(609)	61.9	25.4	12.7	(599)	64.6	25.0	10.4	(604)
$5,000-$9,999	56.2	24.0	19.8	(429)	63.4	26.3	10.4	(415)	64.7	24.8	10.6	(416)
$10,000-$14,999	61.9	21.1	17.0	(247)	69.0	20.8	10.2	(245)	66.7	25.5	7.8	(243)
$15,000 and over	62.3	23.9	13.8	(138)	76.1	20.3	3.6	(138)	69.6	23.9	6.5	(138)
	X^2 not significant at p<0.05				X^2 significant at p<0.05				X^2 not significant at p<0.05			
Education												
8 grades or less	67.2	21.1	13.2	(320)	69.9	22.4	7.7	(312)	72.0	22.6	5.3	(318)
9-11 grades	64.6	20.2	15.2	(376)	63.9	27.7	8.4	(368)	62.6	29.1	8.3	(374)
12 grades	55.9	24.1	20.0	(435)	64.1	21.5	14.4	(423)	64.8	22.6	12.6	(420)
13 or more grades	53.4	23.9	22.7	(352)	61.5	27.5	11.0	(353)	60.8	28.5	10.8	(344)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01			
Work Disability Index												
None	57.3	24.0	18.7	(1049)	63.0	26.6	10.4	(1032)	62.1	28.7	9.2	(1027)
Limited	54.8	27.4	17.7	(62)	55.6	31.7	12.7	(63)	58.1	21.0	21.0	(62)
Disabled	63.3	19.5	17.2	(215)	64.4	22.6	13.0	(208)	70.4	19.7	9.9	(213)
65 or older	75.3	15.8	8.9	(158)	79.9	11.7	8.4	(154)	78.1	15.5	6.5	(155)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01				X^2 significant at p<0.01			
Independent Living Index												
No Limitations	59.8	23.1	17.2	(1240)	64.9	25.1	9.9	(1217)	64.0	26.6	9.4	(1211)
Limited but Independent	61.6	21.9	16.4	(146)	66.2	23.2	10.6	(142)	72.3	19.6	8.1	(148)
Needs Mobility Assistance	62.5	18.8	18.8	(64)	61.5	23.1	15.4	(65)	61.5	23.1	15.4	(65)
Needs Personal Care	55.9	17.6	26.5	(34)	54.5	18.2	27.3	(33)	69.7	24.2	6.1	(33)
	X^2 not significant at p<0.05				X^2 not significant at p<0.05				X^2 not significant at p<0.05			

Figure 8.

The Relationship between Goal-Oriented Variables and Three Measures of Applicant Satisfaction

	Helpful				Fair				Considerate			
	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)	Very	Somewhat	Not at All	(N)
Status of Application												
Received Benefits	72.5	22.8	4.7	(1062)	73.5	22.0	40.4	(1058)	71.4	22.6	6.0	(1040)
Accepted, Waiting	45.1	24.6	30.3	(122)	61.2	23.3	15.5	(116)	58.8	28.6	12.6	(119)
Being Considered	45.7	34.0	20.2	(94)	56.3	32.2	11.5	(87)	66.7	30.2	3.1	(96)
Rejected	8.0	15.3	76.7	(150)	18.6	31.0	50.3	(145)	31.3	34.7	34.0	(147)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.72				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.59				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.42			
Assistance in Presenting Claim												
Extra Assistance	73.5	23.9	2.6	(155)	77.8	20.9	1.3	(153)	75.9	22.8	1.4	(145)
Amount Wanted	62.4	22.3	15.3	(1186)	67.4	24.8	7.8	(1163)	66.4	25.9	7.7	(1171)
Too Little Assistance	20.7	24.0	55.4	(121)	21.2	28.8	50.0	(118)	33.6	29.4	37.0	(119)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.53				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.57				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.46			
Type of Agency												
Federal Insurance	75.3	16.2	8.5	(377)	76.6	16.5	6.9	(364)	80.0	15.7	4.2	(356)
Federal-State Insurance	55.0	29.6	15.4	(331)	63.2	26.7	10.0	(329)	54.8	32.4	12.7	(330)
Welfare	59.5	22.1	18.4	(543)	59.1	27.0	13.9	(533)	62.2	25.8	12.1	(539)
Vocational	36.1	26.3	35.6	(194)	55.3	33.7	11.1	(190)	58.4	34.0	7.6	(197)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.29				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.23				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.20			
Routinization												
Routine	75.3	16.2	8.5	(377)	76.9	16.5	6.6	(363)	80.0	15.7	4.2	(356)
Non-Routine	54.5	25.0	20.5	(1096)	60.4	27.6	12 0	(1083)	59.8	29.1	11.2	(1091)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.42				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.34				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.44			
Residual Need for Services												
Yes	47.4	27.6	25.0	(156)	47.7	31.4	20.9	(153)	52.6	28.9	18.4	(152)
No	61.5	22.1	16.3	(1323)	66.8	23.9	9.3	(1301)	66.4	25.3	8.3	(1300)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = -0.25				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = -0.36				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = -0.28			
Number of Trips to Complete Application												
0	68.8	16.3	14.9	(202)	68.9	19.2	11.9	(193)	70.3	18.2	11.5	(165)
1	63.1	20.0	16.9	(650)	69.2	23.1	7.7	(636)	69.6	23.5	6.9	(655)
2	57.9	26.4	15.7	(280)	63.4	25.8	10.8	(279)	65.9	26.5	7.7	(287)
3 or more	51.0	26.8	22.2	(306)	53.9	30.6	15.5	(304)	53.1	32.2	14.7	(307)
	X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.15				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.17				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.18			
Number of Agencies Contacted												
1	60.8	23.2	16.0	(717)	69.0	22.3	8.7	(700)	66.5	25.3	8.2	(699)
2 or more	59.2	22.2	18.6	(767)	60.6	26.9	12.4	(757)	63.3	26.0	10.7	(758)
	X^2 not significant p<0.05				X^2 significant at p<0.01 Gamma = 0.17				X^2 not significant at p<0.05			

Figure 9a.

Applicants' Evaluation of Helpfulness of Specific Agencies and Programs

Agency or Program	(N)	How helpful was the agency? Very %	Somewhat %	Not at All %
All Agencies	(1483)	59.9	22.7	17.4
Social Security Administration (total programs)	(223)	75.3	15.7	9.0
SSA - Old Age and Survivors	(143)	78.3	16.1	5.6
SSA - Disability	(80)	70.0	15.0	15.0
Veterans Administration	(134)	74.6	18.7	6.7
Unemployment Compensation	(277)	54.5	30.7	14.8
Food Stamps	(188)	63.8	22.3	13.8
Employment and Job Placement Services	(154)	34.4	27.3	38.3
Low-Cost or Public Housing	(64)	37.5	17.2	45.3
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	(56)	64.3	23.2	12.5
State or Local Public Assistance	(188)	59.6	25.0	15.4
Programs for Pensions or Disability Benefits for Government Employees	(16)	81.3	6.3	12.5
Workers Compensation	(44)	52.3	27.3	20.5
Railroad Retirement and Disability Benefits	(4)	75.0	0.0	25.0
Legal Aid Societies or Programs	(38)	63.2	15.8	21.1
Job Training Programs	(22)	59.1	22.7	18.2
Aid to Blind or Disabled	(8)	87.5	0.0	12.5
Vocational Rehabilitation Services	(18)	44.4	22.2	33.3
State Programs for Sickness or Temporary Disability	(10)	80.0	10.0	10.0
Other Agencies	(38)	68.4	15.8	15.8

The distribution is significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

Figure 9b.

Applicants' Evaluation of Fairness
of Specific Agencies and Programs

Agency or Program	(N)	How fair was the agency? Very %	Somewhat %	Not at All %
All Agencies	(1456)	64.6	24.7	10.6
Social Security Administration (total programs)	(212)	78.3	14.6	7.1
SSA - Old Age and Survivors	(135)	84.4	10.4	5.2
SSA - Disability	(77)	67.5	22.1	10.4
Veterans Administration	(131)	74.0	19.8	6.1
Unemployment Compensation	(279)	63.8	26.5	9.7
Food Stamps	(187)	62.0	26.2	11.8
Employment and Job Placement Services	(149)	53.0	35.6	11.4
Low-Cost or Public Housing	(60)	41.7	36.7	21.7
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	(56)	62.5	23.2	14.3
State or Local Public Assistance	(184)	58.2	28.8	13.0
Programs for Pensions or Disability Benefits for Government Employees	(16)	81.3	12.5	6.3
Workers Compensation	(44)	59.1	29.5	11.4
Railroad Retirement and Disability Benefits	(4)	75.0	25.0	0.0
Legal Aid Societies or Programs	(37)	67.6	16.2	16.2
Job Training Programs	(23)	65.2	21.7	13.0
Aid to Blind or Disabled	(8)	87.5	0.0	12.5
Vocational Rehabilitation Services	(18)	61.1	33.3	5.6
State Programs for Sickness or Temporary Disability	(10)	80.0	10.0	10.0
Other Agencies	(37)	81.1	10.8	8.1

The distribution is significant ($p < 0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

Figure 9c.

Applicants' Evaluation of Consideration of Specific Agencies and Programs

Agency or Program	How considerate were the Personnel? (N)	Very %	Somewhat %	Not at All %
All Agencies	(1456)	64.8	25.7	9.5
Social Security Administration (total programs)	(219)	80.8	15.1	4.1
SSA - Old Age and Survivors	(141)	83.0	14.9	2.1
SSA - Disability	(78)	76.9	15.4	7.7
Veterans Administration	(119)	78.2	17.6	4.2
Unemployment Compensation	(281)	54.4	33.8	11.7
Food Stamps	(187)	60.4	27.8	11.8
Employment and Job Placement Services	(156)	55.1	36.5	8.3
Low-Cost or Public Housing	(63)	55.6	31.7	12.7
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	(56)	64.3	21.4	14.3
State or Local Public Assistance	(186)	61.8	26.3	11.8
Programs for Pensions or Disability Benefits for Government Employees	(14)	85.7	14.3	0.0
Workers Compensation	(39)	51.3	28.2	20.5
Railroad Retirement and Disability Benefits	(4)	75.0	0.0	25.0
Legal Aid Societies or Programs	(38)	76.3	13.2	10.5
Job Training Programs	(23)	73.9	21.7	4.3
Aid to Blind or Disabled	(8)	87.5	0.0	12.5
Vocational Rehabilitation Services	(18)	66.7	27.8	5.6
State Programs for Sickness or Temporary Disability	(9)	77.8	11.1	11.1
Other Agencies	(35)	82.9	14.3	2.9

The distribution is significant ($p<0.01$) using the X^2 statistic.

Figure 10a.

Analysis of Variance of Applicant Satisfaction with Public Social Programs

Model of Applicant Satisfaction with Agency Helpfulness

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F	R^2
Model	9	925.44	102.83	71.08	0.001	0.38
Error	970	1534.95	1.58			
Corrected Total	979	2460.39				

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Status of Application	1	701.18	701.18	564.47	0.0001
Claims Assistance	2	82.03	41.02	33.02	0.0001
Type of Agency	2	79.76	39.88	32.11	0.0001
Education	1	34.50	34.50	27.78	0.0001
Status of Application and Claims Assistance[2]	2	21.92	10.96	8.82	0.0002
Status of Application and Education[2]	1	6.05	6.05	4.87	0.0275

[1]Sums of squares are computed eliminating extra variance explained due to multicolinearity.

[2]Interaction effect.

Figure 10b.

Analysis of Variance of Applicant Satisfaction with Public Social Programs

Model of Applicant Satisfaction with Agency Fairness

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F	R^2
Model	16	517.09	32.32	22.76	0.001	0.28
Error	953	1353.82	1.42			
Corrected Total	969	1870.91				

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Status of Application	1	286.21	286.21	255.68	0.0001
Claims Assistance	2	138.43	69.22	61.83	0.0001
Education and Income[2]	4	32.46	8.12	7.25	0.0001
Status of Application and Type of Agency[2]	2	27.41	13.70	12.25	0.0001
Education	1	16.35	16.35	14.61	0.0001
Claims Assistance and Type of Agency[2]	4	16.23	4.06	3.2	0.0006

[1]Sums of squares are computed eliminating extra variance explained through multicolinearity.

[2]Interaction effect.

Figure 10c.

Analysis of Variance of Application Satisfaction with Public Social Programs

Model of Applicant Satisfaction with Agency Consideration

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F	R^2
Model	16	346.54	21.66	15.25	0.001	0.20
Error	948	1346.71	1.42			
Corrected Total	964	1693.25				

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares[1]	Mean Square	F Value	Pr>F
Status of Application	1	116.30	116.30	91.49	0.0001
Claims Assistance	2	93.14	46.57	36.64	0.0001
Status of Application and Income[2]	2	46.88	23.44	18.44	0.0001
Status of Application and Race[2]	2	24.72	12.36	9.72	0.0001
Education and Income[2]	2	23.11	11.56	9.09	0.0001
Status of Application and Type of Agency[2]	4	21.40	5.35	4.21	0.0022
Education	1	12.34	12.34	9.63	0.0020
Income	2	8.65	4.32	3.40	0.0337

Figure 11.

Relationship Between Known Evaluations and Evaluations Predicted by the Analysis of Variance Equations, for Helpful, Fair and Considerate[1]

	Known Values		
	Very	Somewhat	Not at All
Predicted Helpful			
Very	98.6	89.4	41.9
Not at All	1.4	10.6	58.1
(N)	(789)	(282)	(191)
Predicted Fair			
Very	97.4	86.6	45.6
Not at All	2.6	13.4	54.4
(N)	(834)	(292)	(136)
Predicted Considerate			
Very	98.5	94.9	65.3
Not at All	1.5	5.1	34.7
(N)	(844)	(297)	(121)

[1]See the text, pages 28-30, for an explanation of the analysis of variance and prediction procedures employed.